



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,676	02/17/2000	David E. Kronk	FLO1372-026	6566

8698 7590 03/17/2003

STANDLEY & GILCREST LLP
495 METRO PLACE SOUTH
SUITE 210
DUBLIN, OH 43017

EXAMINER

WON, YOUNG N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2155

DATE MAILED: 03/17/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/506,676

Applicant(s)

KRONK, DAVID E.

Examiner

Young N Won

Art Unit

2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 January 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13-18 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 5-11, 13-18, and 20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Amendments A1-A4 have been entered.
2. Claims 4, 12, and 19 have been cancelled.
3. Claims 1-3, 5-12, 13-19, and 20 have been re-examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 7-13, and 15-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joao (US 5917405 A) in view of Greenspan et al. (US 6247065 B1).

Independent:

As per claim 1, Joao teaches of a system (see col.3, lines 13-17) for controlling environment maintenance equipment (see col.1, lines 18-20, 22, 25, & 28, and col.11,

lines 59-67 to col.12, lines 1-4) comprising: an interface control servers (see col.6, lines 2-8) for controlling environment maintenance devices (see col.1, lines 18-20, 22, 25, & 28, and col.11, lines 59-67 to col.12, lines 1-4), said interface control server adapted to respond to interprocess calls (see col.28, lines 59-64 and col.49, lines 43-64); a client for communicating with said interface control servers (see col.5, lines 61-65); and a messaging control at said client (see col.5, lines 66-67 to col.6, line 1) and at each of said plurality of interface control servers (see Fig.5b, #511 and col.6, line 2) for exchanging messages between said client and each of said plurality of interface control servers in accordance with said messaging controls (see col.6, lines 16-25).

Joao does not explicitly teach of a plurality of server. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ a plurality of servers within the system of Joao, because Joao teaches that his method and apparatus can be implemented in many different systems such as anti-theft and/or theft deterrent system, home equipment system, commercial office and/or premise equipment system, and many more (see col.1, lines 18-28), thus if more than one system was to be implemented or utilized, more than one server would be required.

Joao does not explicitly teach that exchanging messages between said client and each of said plurality of interface control servers consists of text messages or that the messaging controls at said interface control servers are adapted to interpret said text messages and to communicate with said interface control servers in accordance with interprocess calls. Greenspan teaches of exchanging messages between said client and each of said plurality of interface control servers consists of text messages (see

col.3, lines 1-8) and that the messaging controls at said interface control servers are adapted to interpret said text messages and to communicate with said interface control servers in accordance with interprocess calls (see col.9, lines 2-14). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Greenspan within the system of Joao by implementing text messages as a communicating means and interpreting the text messages by the messaging control to communicate with the interface control servers within the environment maintenance equipment controlling system because Joao teaches in numerous occasions that communication medium may employ the Internet or World Wide Web (see col.16, lines 30-37; col.29, lines 3-35; and in which the amendment or response states WWW as a "text based system") and also respond to user command or inquiry (see col.21, lines 26-41) which one of ordinary skill in the art will presume to be text commands or text inquiries rather than a user unfriendly language such as Assembly, Fortran or C. Thus, there is sufficient motivation to combine the teachings of Greenspan to the system of Joao.

As per claim 9, Joao teaches of a method (see col.3, line 6) for controlling environment maintenance equipment (see col.1, lines 18-20, 22, 25, & 28, and col.11, lines 59-67 to col.12, lines 1-4) comprising the steps of: connecting an interface control server to an environment maintenance device (see col.13, lines 34-49); installing a first message control at said interface control server (see col.76, lines 7-13 and lines 29-30); installing a second message control at a client (see col.76, lines 15-20); entering a message at said client; communicating said text message from said client to said

interface control server in accordance with said first message control and said second message control; and controlling said environment maintenance device at said interface control server in accordance with interprocess calls provided by said second message control in accordance with said text message (see col.76, lines 15-16). Joao does not explicitly teach that the messages are text or that the said message control is adapted to interpret text messages and to communicate with said interface control server in accordance with interprocess calls. Greenspan teaches that the messages are text or that the said message control is adapted to interpret text messages and to communicate with said interface control server in accordance with interprocess calls (see claim 1 rejection above).

As per claim 17, Joao teaches of an apparatus (see col.3, line 6) for controlling an environment maintenance device (see col.1, lines 18-20, 22, 25, & 28, and col.11, lines 59-67 to col.12, lines 1-4), comprising: an interface control server (see col.6, lines 2-8) adapted for communication with said environment maintenance device (see col.76, lines 7-14); a messaging control at said interface control server for receiving and interpreting text messages from a client (see col.76, lines 7-13 and lines 29-30); and a connection between said interface control server and said environment maintenance device (see col.13, lines 34-35), said connection adapted for communicating a command to said environment maintenance device in accordance with a message from said client (see col.29, lines 10-17). Joao does not explicitly teach that the messages are text messages or that the text messages are interpreted. Greenspan teaches that

Art Unit: 2155

the messages are text messages and that the text messages are interpreted (see claim 1 rejection above).

Dependent:

As per claims 2, 10, and 18, Joao further teaches wherein environment maintenance devices are selected from the group consisting of irrigation sprinklers and controllers, weather stations, constant pressure pump stations, compressor stations, water supply pump stations, sewage controllers, snow guns and controllers, mowers, chair lifts, and snow grooming vehicles (see col.13, line 42).

As per claims 3 and 11, Joao further teaches wherein said client is operational at a device selected from the group consisting of personal computers, laptop computers, touch-screen computers, telephones, radios, and personal digital assistants (see col.15, lines 23-26).

As per claims 5 and 13, Joao teaches of further comprising a system control and data acquisition control at said client for interacting with said interface control servers (see col.13, lines 21-23).

As per claims 7 and 15, Joao teaches of further comprising a site manager for registering said first and second messaging controls (see col.9, lines 37-41).

As per claims 8 and 16, Joao further teaches wherein said client and said interface control server operate in different domains or that interface control server is in a first domain and said client is in a second domain (see col.6, lines 2-8: "and/or").

5. Claims 6, 14, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joao (US 5917405 A) and Greenspan et al. (US 6247065 B1), further in view of Davies et al. (US 6108701 A).

As per claims 6, 14, and 20, Joao and Greenspan do not explicitly teach wherein messages are exchanged between said messaging controls in accordance with TCP/IP protocol. Davies teaches of wherein messages are exchanged between said messaging controls in accordance with TCP/IP protocol (see abstract). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teachings of Davies within the system of Joao and Greenspan, by implementing message exchange using the TCP/IP protocol within the environment maintenance equipment control system, because TCP/IP protocol is a protocol used in communication information via the World Wide Web (see Joao: col.6, lines 2-8).

Response to Remarks

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to all remaining claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Young N Won whose telephone number is 703-605-4241. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th: 8AM-6PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R Sheikh can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-7239 for regular communications and 703-746-7238 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 2155

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Young N Won



March 11, 2003



AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100